arXiv:1406.0578v2 [math.NA] 25 Aug 2014

ON THE TWO MUTUALLY INDEPENDENT FACTORS THAT DETERMINE THE CONVERGENCE OF LEAST-SQUARES PROJECTION METHOD *

SHUKAI DU † AND NAILIN DU ‡

Abstract. The paper investigates the least-squares projection method for bounded linear operators, which provides a natural regularization scheme by projection for many ill-posed problems. Yet, without additional assumptions, the convergence of this approximation scheme cannot be guaranteed. We reveal that the convergence of least-squares projection method is determined by two mutually independent factors – the "kernel approximability" and the "offset angle". The kernel approximability is a necessary condition of convergence described with kernel $\mathcal{N}(T)$ and its subspaces $\mathcal{N}(T)\cap X_n$, and we give several equivalent characterizations for it (Theorem 1.1). The offset angle of X_n is defined as the largest canonical angle between space $T^*T(X_n)$ and $T^\dagger T(X_n)$ (which are subspaces of $\mathcal{N}(T)^\perp$), and it geometrically reflects the rate of convergence (Theorem 1.2). The paper also presents new observations for the unconvergence examples of Seidman [10, Example 3.1] and Du [2, Example 2.10] under the notions of kernel approximability and offset angle.

Key words. least-squares projection method, offset angle, kernel approximability

AMS subject classifications. 47A52; 65J20; 15A09

1. Introduction. In this paper we investigate the least-squares projection method for bounded linear operators. As is generally known, such investigations are the bases for numerically solving operator equations of the first and the second kind (see Du [1] and [2], Groetsch-Neubauer [5], Groetsch [6], Luecke-Hickey [9], Seidman [10], Spies-Temperini [11], Engl-Hank-Neubauer [3], Kress [8], and the references cited therein).

Let X and Y be Hilbert spaces, and $T\in\mathcal{B}(X,Y)$, i.e., $T:X\to Y$ be a bounded linear operator. Let $T^\dagger$ and T^* denote its Moore-Penrose inverse and adjoint operator, $\mathcal{D}(T)$, $\mathcal{N}(T)$, $\mathcal{R}(T)$, and $\mathcal{G}(T)$ denote its domain, kernel, range, and graph, respectively. If X_0 and Y_0 are closed subspaces of X and Y, P_{X_0} and P_{Y_0} will stand for the orthogonal projections from X onto X_0 and from Y onto Y_0, respectively. Let $X\times Y$ be the Hilbert space with the inner product defined by

$$\langle(x_1,y_1),(x_2,y_2)\rangle:=\langle x_1,x_2\rangle+\langle y_1,y_2\rangle\quad\forall(x_1,y_1),(x_2,y_2)\in X\times Y.$$

Let $\{X_n\}$ be a sequence of finite-dimensional subspaces of X with $\dim X=\infty$ such that

$$\operatorname*{s-lim}_{n\to\infty}P_{X_n}=I_X,$$

and set

$$T_n:=TP_{X_n}\quad\forall n\in\mathbb{N}.$$

We say $\{(X_n,T_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a LPA (least-squares projection approximation) for T. All of our discussions in this paper will be based on this setting. Note that, if $\{X_n\}$ is an increasing sequence

$$X_0\subseteq X_1\subseteq X_2\subseteq\cdots\quad\text{with}\quad\overline{\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty}X_n}=X,$$

* The manuscript of this paper could be found at arXiv:1406.0578.

†Corresponding author. School of Mathematics and Statistics, Wuhan University, Wuhan, People's Republic of China. (shukai.du@whu.edu.cn).

‡School of Mathematics and Statistics, Wuhan University, Wuhan, People's Republic of China. (nldu.math@whu.edu.cn).

then $\{(X_n, T_n)\}$ is a natural LPA for T.

We are interested in approximating $T^\dagger$ by $T_n^\dagger$ when $\dim \mathcal{R}(T) = \infty$, which is the least-squares projection method for T. So the issue of convergence of LPA $\{(X_n, T_n)\}$

$$\operatorname*{w\text{-}lim}_{n\to\infty} T_n^\dagger = T^\dagger \text{ on } \mathcal{D}\left(T^\dagger\right) \quad (\textit{Weak Convergence}) \tag{1.1}$$

and

$$\operatorname*{s\text{-}lim}_{n\to\infty} T_n^\dagger = T^\dagger \text{ on } \mathcal{D}\left(T^\dagger\right) \quad (\textit{Strong Convergence}) \tag{1.2}$$

naturally arise. Note that without additional assumptions it cannot be guaranteed that (1.1) or (1.2) holds, as Seidman's example [10, Example 3.1] and Du's example [2, Example 2.10] show. By Groetsch [6, Proposition 0] and Du [2, Theorem 2.6 with Table 4.1] there exists the following convergence result:

$$(1.1) \Longleftrightarrow (1.2) \Longleftrightarrow (1.3),$$

where

$$\sup_n \left\|T_n^\dagger T\right\| < +\infty. \tag{1.3}$$

However, as condition (1.3) lacks geometric intuition, it is still difficult for us to choose a suitable LPA such that (1.3) holds. By Du [2, Theorem 2.2], (1.3) implies that

$$\operatorname*{s\text{-}lim}_{n\to\infty} P_{\mathcal{N}(T_n)} = P_{\mathcal{N}(T)},$$

which is equivalent to

$$\mathcal{N}(T) = \left\{x \in X : \lim_{n\to\infty} \operatorname{dist}\left(x, \mathcal{N}(T) \cap X_n\right) = 0\right\}. \tag{1.4}$$

Hence, (1.4) is necessary in choosing a suitable LPA for T, namely, (1.4) is a necessary condition of (1.3). Here, we remark that (1.4) does not naturally hold (see [2, Example 2.10]), but it is more likely to be satisfied compared to (1.3) (for instance, when T is injection, (1.4) always holds). However, as (1.4) is not a sufficient condition of (1.3) (see [10, Example 3.1]), we still need some complementary conditions with which (1.4) could lead to (1.3).

In this paper, we aim to find the complementary condition which together with (1.4) constitute a necessary and sufficient condition of the convergence of least-squares projection method. We hope that the complementary condition has enough geometrical meanings, so as to give us new insight about least-squares projection method. We obtain the following main results:

- Several equivalent conditions of (1.4) are given. Notice that
$$\mathcal{N}(T_n) = \mathcal{N}(T) \cap X_n + X_n^\perp,$$
therefore, $\mathcal{N}(T) \cap X_n$ will be referred to as the core of $\mathcal{N}(T_n)$, and the condition (1.4) will be called as *kernel approximability* of LPA $\{(X_n, T_n)\}$.
- A new concept called "*offset angle*" of X_n is introduced to describe the complementary condition, which is defined as the largest canonical angle between space $T^*T(X_n)$ and $T^\dagger T(X_n)$. In the case of $\dim \mathcal{N}(T) < \infty$, we show that LPA $\{(X_n, T_n)\}$ is convergent if and only if it has the kernel approximability and the supreme of all offset angles is less than perpendicular angle. Moreover, if LPA $\{(X_n, T_n)\}$ is with kernel approximability, the rate of convergence of LPA $\{(X_n, T_n)\}$ is geometrically reflected by the offset angles.

- The classical unconvergence example of Seidman is restudied under the concept of offset angle, and we show that the reason for unconvergence is actually caused by offset angle of X_n tending towards perpendicular angle. On the other hand, the unconvergence example of Du is also restudied, which is with constant zero offset angle, and we show that the reason for unconvergence is caused by (1.4) (kernel approximability) becoming invalid.

In order to expound our main results more precisely, the following notations are needed: If $\{S_n\}$ is a sequence of nonempty subsets of a Banach space, define

$$\underset{n\to\infty}{\text{s-}\lim} S_n := \{x : \text{there is a sequence } \{x_n\} \text{ such that } S_n \ni x_n \to x\},$$

$$\underset{n\to\infty}{\text{w-}\widetilde{\lim}} S_n := \left\{x : \text{there is a sequence } \{x_n\} \text{ such that } \overset{\infty}{\underset{k=n}{\cup}} S_k \ni x_n \rightharpoonup x\right\}.$$

If M and N are both closed subspaces of a Hilbert space H, define

$$\text{gap}\,(M,N) := \max\{\delta(M,N), \delta(N,M)\},$$

where

$$\delta(M,N) := \begin{cases} \sup\{\text{dist}\,(x,N) : x \in M, \|x\| = 1\}, & \text{if } M \neq \{0\}, \\ 0, & \text{if } M = \{0\}. \end{cases}$$

gap (M,N) is called the *gap* between M and N (see [7]). When

$$m := \dim(M) \leq \dim(N) < \infty,$$

the canonical angles (or principal angles) between M and N can be defined, which are a sequence of m angles $0 \leq \vartheta_1 \leq \vartheta_2 \leq ... \leq \vartheta_m \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$. By [4], the canonical angles are defined recursively by

$$\cos\vartheta_k = \max_{u\epsilon M}\max_{v\epsilon N}\langle u,v\rangle = \langle u_k, v_k\rangle$$

subject to

$$\begin{cases} \|u\| = \|v\| = 1, \\ \langle u, u_i\rangle = 0 \qquad i = 1\colon k-1, \\ \langle v, v_i\rangle = 0 \qquad i = 1\colon k-1, \end{cases}$$

and if $\dim(M) = \dim(N) < \infty$, the largest canonical angle ϑ_m satisfies

$$\sin\vartheta_m = \text{gap}\,(M,N). \tag{1.5}$$

With the above notions, the main theorems of the paper are stated as below:

THEOREM 1.1. *Let $T \in \mathcal{B}(X,Y)$ have LPA $\{(X_n,T_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

(a) Kernel Approximability*: (1.4) is valid, namely,*

$$\underset{n\to\infty}{\text{s-}\lim}\mathcal{N}(T_n) = \underset{n\to\infty}{\text{w-}\widetilde{\lim}}\mathcal{N}(T_n) = \mathcal{N}(T).$$

(b) Inverse-graph Approximability*:*

$$\underset{n\to\infty}{\text{s-}\lim}\mathcal{G}\left(T_n^\dagger\right) = \underset{n\to\infty}{\text{w-}\widetilde{\lim}}\mathcal{G}\left(T_n^\dagger\right) = \mathcal{G}\left(T^\dagger\right).$$

(c) Bounded-weak Convergence*: If a sequence* $\{y_n\} \subseteq Y$ *satisfies*

$$\sup_n \left\|T_n^\dagger y_n\right\| < +\infty \quad \textit{and} \quad \operatorname*{w\text{-}lim}_{n\to\infty} y_n = y,$$

then

$$y \in \mathcal{D}\left(T^\dagger\right) \quad \textit{and} \quad \operatorname*{w\text{-}lim}_{n\to\infty} T_n^\dagger y = T^\dagger y.$$

THEOREM 1.2. *Let* $T \in \mathcal{B}(X,Y)$ *with* $\dim \mathcal{N}(T) < \infty$ *have LPA* $\{(X_n, T_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. *Set*

$$\theta_n := \arcsin \operatorname{gap}\left(T^\dagger T(X_n), T^* T(X_n)\right) \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{1.6}$$

which is called the offset angle *of* X_n *respect to* T. *Then the following propositions hold:*

(a) $\{\theta_n\}$ *is a sequence in the interval* $\left[0, \frac{\pi}{2}\right)$, *and there holds*

$$\textit{(1.3)} \Longleftrightarrow \begin{cases} \textit{(1.4)}, \\ \sup_n \theta_n < \frac{\pi}{2}. \end{cases}$$

(b) If (1.4) is valid, then there is a $n_* \in \mathbb{N}$ *such that, for* $n \geq n_*$,

$$\left\|T_n^\dagger y - T^\dagger y\right\| \leq \sqrt{1+\tan^2\theta_n}\operatorname{dist}\left(T^\dagger y, X_n\right) \quad \forall y \in \mathcal{D}\left(T^\dagger\right),$$

and

$$\theta_n = 0 \Longleftrightarrow T_n^\dagger = P_{X_n} T^\dagger \textit{ on } \mathcal{D}\left(T^\dagger\right) \Longleftrightarrow \mathcal{N}(T) + T^* T(X_n) \subseteq X_n.$$

REMARK 1.1. *As* $\dim(T^\dagger T(X_n)) = \dim(T^* T(X_n)) < \infty$, *the offset angle* θ_n *of* X_n *respect to* T *is the largest canonical angle between* $T^\dagger T(X_n)$ *and* $T^* T(X_n)$ *by (1.5).*

The proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 are in Section 2 and Section 3 respectively. In section 4, the two unconvergence examples of Seidman and Du will be restudied to further explain the relations among the three concepts of *convergence, kernel approximability* and *offset angle*. Our conclusions will be collected in Section 5.

2. Proof of Theorem 1.1. To prove Theorem 1.1, we need some lemmas.

LEMMA 2.1. *Let* H *be a Hilbert space and* $\{H_n\}$ *a sequence of closed subspaces of* H.

(a) *There holds*

$$\{P_{H_n}\} \textit{ is strongly convergent } \Longleftrightarrow \operatorname*{s\text{-}lim}_{n\to\infty} H_n = \operatorname*{w\text{-}\widetilde{lim}}_{n\to\infty} H_n,$$

and when $\{P_{H_n}\}$ *is strongly convergent, we have*

$$\operatorname*{s\text{-}lim}_{n\to\infty} P_{H_n} = P_M, \quad \textit{where } M := \operatorname*{s\text{-}lim}_{n\to\infty} H_n.$$

(b) *If* N *is a closed subspace of* H, *then*

$$\operatorname*{s\text{-}lim}_{n\to\infty} P_{H_n} = P_N \iff \operatorname*{w\text{-}lim}_{n\to\infty} P_{H_n} = P_N.$$

Proof. See [1, Lemma 2.13] and [2, Lemma 2.1]. □

LEMMA 2.2. *Let $T \in \mathcal{B}(X,Y)$ have LPA $\{(X_n, T_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$.*

(a) *There hold*

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{R}(T_n) = T(X_n) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(T), \quad \underset{n\to\infty}{\text{s-lim}} P_{\mathcal{R}(T_n)} = P_{\overline{\mathcal{R}(T)}}, \\ \mathcal{N}(T_n) = (\mathcal{N}(T) \cap X_n) \overset{\perp}{\oplus} X_n^{\perp}, \quad P_{\mathcal{N}(T_n)} = P_{\mathcal{N}(T)\cap X_n} + I - P_{X_n}, \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

and

$$T_n^{\dagger} y - T^{\dagger} y = \left(T_n^{\dagger} T - I\right)(I - P_{X_n}) T^{\dagger} y \quad \forall\, y \in \mathcal{D}\left(T^{\dagger}\right). \tag{2.2}$$

(b) *There hold*

$$\underset{n\to\infty}{\text{s-lim}} P_{\mathcal{N}(T_n)} = P_{\mathcal{N}(T)} \Longleftrightarrow \underset{n\to\infty}{\text{s-lim}} P_{\mathcal{N}(T)\cap X_n} = P_{\mathcal{N}(T)} \Longleftrightarrow \textit{(1.4)},$$

and

$$\textit{(1.1)} \Longleftrightarrow \textit{(1.2)} \Longleftrightarrow \textit{(1.3)} \Longrightarrow \textit{(1.4)}.$$

(c) *If (1.4) and $\dim \mathcal{N}(T) < \infty$ are valid, then there is a $n_* \in \mathbb{N}$ such that*

$$\left.\begin{array}{r} X_n \supseteq \mathcal{N}(T), \\ \mathcal{N}(T_n) = \mathcal{N}(T) \overset{\perp}{\oplus} X_n^{\perp} \end{array}\right\} \quad \textit{for } n \geq n_*, \tag{2.3}$$

Proof. (a) It is clear that

$$\mathcal{R}(T_n) = T(X_n) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(T),$$

and

$$\mathcal{R}(T) \subseteq \underset{n\to\infty}{\text{s-}\lim} \mathcal{R}(T_n) \subseteq \underset{n\to\infty}{\text{w-}\widetilde{\lim}} \mathcal{R}(T_n) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{R}(T)}.$$

Since $\text{s-lim}_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{R}(T_n)$ is closed by [1, Lemma 2.7], we have

$$\underset{n\to\infty}{\text{s-}\lim} \mathcal{R}(T_n) = \underset{n\to\infty}{\text{w-}\widetilde{\lim}} \mathcal{R}(T_n) = \overline{\mathcal{R}(T)}.$$

By Lemma 2.1 that is equivalent to

$$\underset{n\to\infty}{\text{s-lim}} P_{\mathcal{R}(T_n)} = P_{\overline{\mathcal{R}(T)}}. \tag{2.4}$$

It is clear that

$$\mathcal{N}(T_n) = (\mathcal{N}(T) \cap X_n) \overset{\perp}{\oplus} X_n^{\perp}, \quad P_{\mathcal{N}(T_n)} = P_{\mathcal{N}(T)\cap X_n} + I - P_{X_n},$$

and hence for all $y \in \mathcal{D}\left(T^{\dagger}\right)$

$$\begin{aligned} T_n^{\dagger} y - T^{\dagger} y &= T_n^{\dagger}\left(TT^{\dagger} - TP_{X_n}T^{\dagger}\right) y + \left(T_n^{\dagger} T_n - T^{\dagger} T\right) T^{\dagger} y \\ &= T_n^{\dagger} T (I - P_{X_n}) T^{\dagger} y + \left(P_{\mathcal{N}(T_n)^{\perp}} - P_{\mathcal{N}(T)^{\perp}}\right) T^{\dagger} y \\ &= T_n^{\dagger} T (I - P_{X_n}) T^{\dagger} y + (P_{X_n} - I) T^{\dagger} y \\ &= \left(T_n^{\dagger} T - I\right)(I - P_{X_n}) T^{\dagger} y. \end{aligned}$$

(b) It follows from (2.1) that

$$\operatorname*{s-lim}_{n\to\infty} P_{\mathcal{N}(T_n)} = P_{\mathcal{N}(T)} \Longleftrightarrow \operatorname*{s-lim}_{n\to\infty} P_{\mathcal{N}(T)\cap X_n} = P_{\mathcal{N}(T)}.$$

Note that

$$\operatorname*{s-lim}_{n\to\infty} \left(\mathcal{N}\left(T\right)\cap X_n\right) = \left\{x\in X \,:\, \lim_{n\to\infty} \operatorname{dist}\left(x, \mathcal{N}\left(T\right)\cap X_n\right) = 0\right\}$$

and

$$\operatorname*{s-lim}_{n\to\infty} \left(\mathcal{N}\left(T\right)\cap X_n\right) \subseteq \operatorname*{w-\widetilde{lim}}_{n\to\infty} \left(\mathcal{N}\left(T\right)\cap X_n\right) \subseteq \mathcal{N}\left(T\right).$$

Then, by Lemma 2.1,

$$\begin{aligned}(1.4) &\Longleftrightarrow \operatorname*{s-lim}_{n\to\infty} \left(\mathcal{N}\left(T\right)\cap X_n\right) = \operatorname*{w-\widetilde{lim}}_{n\to\infty} \left(\mathcal{N}\left(T\right)\cap X_n\right) = \mathcal{N}\left(T\right).\\ &\Longleftrightarrow \operatorname*{s-lim}_{n\to\infty} P_{\mathcal{N}(T)\cap X_n} = P_{\mathcal{N}(T)}\\ &\Longleftrightarrow \operatorname*{s-lim}_{n\to\infty} P_{\mathcal{N}(T_n)} = P_{\mathcal{N}(T)}.\end{aligned}$$

Clearly, by the uniform boundedness principle and (2.2) we have that

$$(1.2) \Longleftrightarrow (1.1) \Longleftrightarrow (1.3).$$

From (2.2) it follows that

$$T_n^{\dagger}T_n - T^{\dagger}TP_{X_n} = \left(T_n^{\dagger}T - I\right)\left(I - P_{X_n}\right)T^{\dagger}TP_{X_n},$$

so, by (2.1), there is

$$P_{\mathcal{N}(T)\cap X_n} - P_{\mathcal{N}(T)}P_{X_n} = \left(T_n^{\dagger}T - I\right)P_{X_n^{\perp}}P_{\mathcal{N}(T)}\left(I - P_{X_n^{\perp}}\right).$$

Hence, (1.3) implies that

$$P_{\mathcal{N}(T)\cap X_n} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{s}} P_{\mathcal{N}(T)} \ \ (n\to\infty), \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad (1.4) \text{ holds.}$$

(c) Since (1.4) is equivalent to

$$\operatorname*{s-lim}_{n\to\infty} P_{\mathcal{N}(T)\cap X_n} = P_{\mathcal{N}(T)},$$

and since

$$\mathcal{N}(T)\cap X_n \subseteq \mathcal{N}(T), \quad \dim\left(\mathcal{N}(T)\cap X_n\right) \le \dim\mathcal{N}\left(T\right) < \infty,$$

there holds

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \left\|P_{\mathcal{N}(T)\cap X_n} - P_{\mathcal{N}(T)}\right\| = 0.$$

Thus, there is a $n_* \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\left\|P_{\mathcal{N}(T)\cap X_n} - P_{\mathcal{N}(T)}\right\| < 1 \quad \text{for } n \ge n_*.$$

Note that this implies that $\operatorname{rank} P_{\mathcal{N}(T)\cap X_n} = \operatorname{rank} P_{\mathcal{N}(T)}$ by [12, Theorem 2.3] (in fact, $P_{\mathcal{N}(T)\cap X_n}$ and $P_{\mathcal{N}(T)}$ are unitarily equivalent by [7, p.56, Theorem 6.32]), and therefore

$$\dim\left(\mathcal{N}(T)\cap X_n\right) = \dim\mathcal{N}\left(T\right) \quad \text{for } n \ge n_*.$$

So, we have

$$X_n \supseteq \mathcal{N}(T) \cap X_n = \mathcal{N}(T) \quad \text{for } n \geq n_*,$$

and therefore

$$\mathcal{N}(T_n) = (\mathcal{N}(T) \cap X_n) \overset{\perp}{\oplus} X_n^{\perp} = \mathcal{N}(T) \overset{\perp}{\oplus} X_n^{\perp} \quad \text{for } n \geq n_*.$$

Thus, we obtain (2.3). □

LEMMA 2.3. *Let $T \in \mathcal{B}(X,Y)$ have LPA $\{(X_n, T_n)\}$. Then*

$$\operatorname{s-}\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{G}(T_n) = \operatorname{w-}\widetilde{\lim}_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{G}(T_n) = \mathcal{G}(T).$$

Proof. It is clear that $\operatorname{s-lim}_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{G}(T_n) \subseteq \operatorname{w-}\widetilde{\lim}_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{G}(T_n)$. Hence, we need only to show that

$$\operatorname{w-}\widetilde{\lim}_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{G}(T_n) \subseteq \mathcal{G}(T) \subseteq \operatorname{s-}\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{G}(T_n).$$

Let $(x,y) \in \mathcal{G}(T)$. Then $(x, T_n x) \in \mathcal{G}(T_n)$, and $(x, T_n x) \to (x,y)$ $(n \to \infty)$. Therefore, $(x,y) \in \operatorname{s-lim}_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{G}(T_n)$. This gives that

$$\mathcal{G}(T) \subseteq \operatorname{s-}\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{G}(T_n).$$

Let $(x,y) \in \operatorname{w-}\widetilde{\lim}_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{G}(T_n)$. Then there is a sequence $\{(x_n, y_n)\}$ such that $\cup_{k=n}^{\infty} \mathcal{G}(T_k) \ni (x_n, y_n) \rightharpoonup (x,y)$ $(n \to \infty)$. Thus, there is a sequence $\{k_n\}$ such that

$$k_n \geq n, \quad x_n \rightharpoonup x \ (n \to \infty), \quad T_{k_n} x_n = y_n \rightharpoonup y \ (n \to \infty).$$

Note that for all $v \in Y$ there holds

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle Tx - y, v\rangle| &\leq |\langle T(x - x_n), v\rangle| + |\langle (T - T_{k_n}) x_n, v\rangle| + |\langle y_n - y, v\rangle| \\ &= |\langle x - x_n, T^* v\rangle| + \left|\left\langle x_n, \left(I - P_{X_{k_n}}\right) T^* v\right\rangle\right| + |\langle y_n - y, v\rangle|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$\langle Tx - y, v\rangle = 0 \ \forall v \in X, \quad \text{that is,} \quad (x,y) \in \mathcal{G}(T).$$

This gives that

$$\operatorname{w-}\widetilde{\lim}_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{G}(T_n) \subseteq \mathcal{G}(T).$$

□

Now, we can prove Theorem 1.1 as follows.

Proof. [Proof of Theorem 1.1] By statement (b) of Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.1, we have

$$(1.4) \iff \operatorname{s-}\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{N}(T_n) = \operatorname{w-}\widetilde{\lim}_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{N}(T_n) = \mathcal{N}(T).$$

(a) $\Longrightarrow$ (b): Let (a) hold. Then, by Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\operatorname{s-}\lim_{n\to\infty} P_{\mathcal{N}(T_n)^{\perp}} = P_{\mathcal{N}(T)^{\perp}}. \tag{2.5}$$

By statement (a) of Lemma 2.2,

$$\underset{n\to\infty}{\text{s-lim}} P_{\mathcal{R}(T_n)^\perp} = P_{\mathcal{R}(T)^\perp}. \tag{2.6}$$

To prove (b) we need only to show that

$$\underset{n\to\infty}{\text{w-}\widetilde{\lim}}\mathcal{G}\left(T_n^\dagger\right) \subseteq \mathcal{G}\left(T^\dagger\right) \subseteq \underset{n\to\infty}{\text{s-lim}}\mathcal{G}\left(T_n^\dagger\right). \tag{2.7}$$

Let $(y,x) \in \mathcal{G}\left(T^\dagger\right)$. Then

$$\left(T^\dagger y, P_{\overline{\mathcal{R}(T)}} y\right) = \left(T^\dagger y, TT^\dagger y\right) = (x, Tx) \in \mathcal{G}(T).$$

By Lemma 2.3, $\text{s-lim}_{n\to\infty}\mathcal{G}(T_n) = \mathcal{G}(T)$, hence there is a sequence $\{x_n\}$ such that

$$x_n \to x \ (n\to\infty), \quad T_n x_n \to Tx \ (n\to\infty).$$

This with (2.5) and (2.6) implies that

$$\begin{cases} T_n x_n \to Tx \ (n\to\infty), \\ P_{\mathcal{N}(T_n)^\perp} x_n \to P_{\mathcal{N}(T)^\perp} x \ (n\to\infty), \\ P_{\mathcal{R}(T_n)^\perp} y \to P_{\mathcal{R}(T)^\perp} y \ (n\to\infty), \end{cases}$$

and therefore

$$\begin{cases} T_n x_n + P_{\mathcal{R}(T_n)^\perp} y \to Tx + P_{\mathcal{R}(T)^\perp} y = y \ (n\to\infty), \\ T_n^\dagger \left(T_n x_n + P_{\mathcal{R}(T_n)^\perp} y\right) \to T^\dagger Tx = T^\dagger y = x \ (n\to\infty). \end{cases}$$

Thus, $(y,x) \in \text{s-lim}_{n\to\infty}\mathcal{G}\left(T_n^\dagger\right)$, we get

$$\mathcal{G}\left(T^\dagger\right) \subseteq \underset{n\to\infty}{\text{s-lim}}\mathcal{G}\left(T_n^\dagger\right).$$

Let $(y,x) \in \text{w-}\widetilde{\lim}_{n\to\infty}\mathcal{G}\left(T_n^\dagger\right)$. Then there is a sequence $\{(y_n, x_n)\}$ such that

$$\overset{\infty}{\underset{k=n}{\cup}} \mathcal{G}\left(T_k^\dagger\right) \ni (y_n, x_n) \rightharpoonup (y,x) \ (n\to\infty).$$

Hence, there is a sequence $\{k_n\}$ such that

$$k_n \geq n, \quad y_n \rightharpoonup y \ (n\to\infty), \quad T_{k_n}^\dagger y_n = x_n \rightharpoonup x \ (n\to\infty). \tag{2.8}$$

By (2.1) in statement (a) of Lemma 2.2, we have (2.4) and $T_{k_n}^\dagger y_n \in \mathcal{N}(T_{k_n})^\perp \subseteq X_{k_n}$. From (2.8), (2.5), by Lemma 2.1, we have

$$x \in \underset{n\to\infty}{\text{w-}\widetilde{\lim}}\mathcal{N}(T_n)^\perp = \mathcal{N}(T)^\perp,$$

$$T_{k_n} x_n = T_{k_n} T_{k_n}^\dagger y_n = TT_{k_n}^\dagger y_n \rightharpoonup Tx \ (n\to\infty),$$

and for any $v \in X$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle T_{k_n} x_n, v\rangle &= \left\langle P_{\mathcal{R}(T_{k_n})} y_n, v\right\rangle = \left\langle y_n, P_{\mathcal{R}(T_{k_n})} v\right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle y_n, \left(P_{\mathcal{R}(T_{k_n})} - P_{\overline{\mathcal{R}(T)}}\right) v\right\rangle + \left\langle y_n, P_{\overline{\mathcal{R}(T)}} v\right\rangle \\ &\to \left\langle y, P_{\overline{\mathcal{R}(T)}} v\right\rangle = \left\langle P_{\overline{\mathcal{R}(T)}} y, v\right\rangle \ (n\to\infty). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$x \in \mathcal{N}(T)^{\perp},\ Tx = P_{\overline{\mathcal{R}(T)}}y, \quad \text{that is,} \quad (y,x) \in \mathcal{G}\left(T^{\dagger}\right).$$

So, we obtain that

$$\operatorname*{w\text{-}\widetilde{lim}}_{n\to\infty}\mathcal{G}\left(T_n^{\dagger}\right) \subseteq \mathcal{G}\left(T^{\dagger}\right).$$

Now, (2.7) is proved.

(b) $\Longrightarrow$ (c): Let (b) hold. To prove (c) let $\{y_n\} \subseteq Y$ satisfy

$$\sup_n \left\|T_n^{\dagger}y_n\right\| < +\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \operatorname*{w\text{-}lim}_{n\to\infty} y_n = y.$$

Then any subsequence $\left\{T_{n_k}^{\dagger}y_{n_k}\right\}$ of $\left\{T_n^{\dagger}y_n\right\}$ has a subsequence, again denoted by $\left\{T_{n_k}^{\dagger}y_{n_k}\right\}$, converging weakly to some $u \in X$. By use of (b) we have that

$$(y,u) \in \operatorname*{w\text{-}\widetilde{lim}}_{n\to\infty}\mathcal{G}\left(T_n^{\dagger}\right) = \mathcal{G}\left(T^{\dagger}\right).$$

This gives that

$$y \in \mathcal{D}\left(T^{\dagger}\right), \quad T_{n_k}^{\dagger}y_{n_k} \rightharpoonup u = T^{\dagger}y \quad (k \to \infty)$$

So, every subsequence of $\left\{T_n^{\dagger}y_n\right\}$ has a subsequence converging weakly to $T^{\dagger}y$ and hence

$$T_n^{\dagger}y_n \rightharpoonup T^{\dagger}y \quad (n \to \infty).$$

Thus, we obtain (c).

(c) $\Longrightarrow$ (a): Let (c) hold. To prove (a), by statement (b) of Lemma 2.2 we need only to show that

$$\operatorname*{s\text{-}lim}_{n\to\infty} P_{\mathcal{N}(T_n)} = P_{\mathcal{N}(T)}. \tag{2.9}$$

In fact, for any $x \in X$ let

$$y_n := T_n x \ \ (n \in \mathbb{N}),$$

then

$$y_n \to Tx \ \ (n \to \infty) \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_n \left\|T_n^{\dagger}y_n\right\| \le \|x\|.$$

Due to (c), it follows that

$$T_n^{\dagger}T_n x = T_n^{\dagger}y_n \rightharpoonup T^{\dagger}Tx \quad (n \to \infty).$$

Hence we have that

$$\operatorname*{w\text{-}lim}_{n\to\infty} P_{\mathcal{N}(T_n)} = P_{\mathcal{N}(T)}.$$

This is equivalent to (2.9) by Lemma 2.1. □

3. Proof of Theorem 1.2. To prove Theorem 1.2, we need more lemmas besides Lemma 2.2.

LEMMA 3.1. *If P, Q are orthogonal-projections on a Hilbert space H, then*

$$\|P-Q\| = \max\left\{\|(I-Q)P\|, \|(I-P)Q\|\right\} \le 1,$$

and if $\|P-Q\| < 1$, there holds

$$\|P-Q\| = \|(I-Q)\,P\| = \|(I-P)\,Q\|.$$

Proof. Since $(I-Q)P = (P-Q)P,\ (I-P)Q = (Q-P)Q$, it follows that

$$\|(I-Q)\,P\| \le \|P-Q\|, \qquad \|(I-P)\,Q\| \le \|P-Q\|,$$

and therefore

$$\max\left\{\|(I-Q)P\|, \|(I-P)Q\|\right\} \le \|P-Q\|.$$

Note that for each $x \in H$ there hold

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(P-Q)x\|^2 &= \|(I-Q)Px\|^2 + \|Q(I-P)x\|^2 \\
&\le \|(I-Q)P\|^2\|Px\|^2 + \|Q(I-P)\|^2\|(I-P)x\|^2 \\
&= \|(I-Q)P\|^2\|Px\|^2 + \|(I-P)^*Q^*\|^2\|(I-P)x\|^2 \\
&\le (\max\{\|(I-Q)P\|, \|(I-P)Q\|\})^2\|x\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

that is

$$\|P-Q\| \le \max\left\{\|(I-Q)P\|, \|(I-P)Q\|\right\}.$$

Thus we obtain

$$\|P-Q\| = \max\{\|(I-Q)\,P\|, \|(I-P)\,Q\| \le 1.$$

The rest follows from [7, Theorem 6.34, pp.56-58]. □

LEMMA 3.2. *Let M, N be two closed subspaces of a Hilbert space H. Then*

$$\delta(M,N) = \|(I-P_N)\,P_M\|, \quad \text{gap}\,(M,N) = \|P_M - P_N\|,$$

and

$$\text{gap}\,(M,N) = \delta(M,N) = \delta(N,M) \quad \textit{if gap}\,(M,N) < 1.$$

Proof. If $M = 0$, it is clear that

$$\delta(M,N) = 0 = \|(I-P_N)\,P_M\|.$$

Next, assume $M \neq \{0\}$. Then we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta(M,N) &= \sup\{\text{dist}\,(x,N) : x \in M,\ \|x\| = 1\} \\
&= \sup\{\|(I-P_N)\,x\| : x \in M,\ \|x\| = 1\} \\
&= \sup\{\|(I-P_N)\,P_M x\| : x \in M,\ \|x\| = 1\} \\
&\le \|(I-P_N)\,P_M\|,
\end{aligned}$$

and that for $x \in H$ with $\|x\| = 1$ there holds

$$\begin{aligned}\|(I - P_N) P_M x\| &= \text{dist } (P_M x, N) \\ &\leq \delta(M, N) \|P_M x\| \leq \delta(M, N),\end{aligned}$$

that is,

$$\|(I - P_N) P_M\| \leq \delta(M, N).$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\delta(M, N) = \|(I - P_N) P_M\|.$$

This with Lemma 3.1 gives that

$$\text{gap } (M, N) = \|P_M - P_N\|,$$

and

$$\text{gap } (M, N) = \delta(M, N) = \delta(N, M) \quad \text{if gap } (M, N) < 1.$$

□

LEMMA 3.3. *Let S be an oblique-projection on a Hilbert space H ($S^2 = S \in \mathcal{B}(H)$). Then*

$$\left\|P_{\mathcal{R}(S)} - P_{\mathcal{R}(S^*)}\right\| = \left\|P_{\mathcal{R}(S)} P_{\mathcal{N}(S)}\right\| = \left\|P_{\mathcal{N}(S)} P_{\mathcal{R}(S)}\right\|,$$

and

$$\left\|P_{\mathcal{N}(S)} P_{\mathcal{R}(S)}\right\| = \begin{cases} \sqrt{1 - \|S\|^{-2}}, & \text{as } S \neq 0, \\ 0, & \text{as } S = 0; \end{cases}$$

Proof. Let $x \in H$. Since $\mathcal{N}(S) = \mathcal{R}(I - S)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|x\|^2 &= \left\|Sx + P_{\mathcal{N}(S)}(I - S)x\right\|^2 \\ &= \left\|P_{\mathcal{N}(S)} x\right\|^2 + \left\|(I - P_{\mathcal{N}(S)}) Sx\right\|^2 \\ &= \|P_{\mathcal{N}(S)} x\|^2 + \|Sx\|^2 - \|P_{\mathcal{N}(S)} Sx\|^2 \\ &= \|P_{\mathcal{N}(S)} x\|^2 + \|Sx\|^2 - \|P_{\mathcal{N}(S)} P_{\mathcal{R}(S)} Sx\|^2 \\ &\geqslant \|P_{\mathcal{N}(S)} x\|^2 + \|Sx\|^2 \left(1 - \|P_{\mathcal{N}(S)} P_{\mathcal{R}(S)}\|^2\right),\end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$\|(I - P_{\mathcal{N}(S)})x\|^2 = \|x\|^2 - \|P_{\mathcal{N}(S)} x\|^2 \geq (1 - \|P_{\mathcal{N}(S)} P_{\mathcal{R}(S)}\|^2) \|Sx\|^2.$$

This implies

$$\|I - P_{\mathcal{N}(S)}\|^2 \geq (1 - \|P_{\mathcal{N}(S)} P_{\mathcal{R}(S)}\|^2) \|S\|^2.$$

So, if $S \neq 0$, there holds

$$1 = \|I - P_{\mathcal{N}(S)}\|^2 \geq \|S\|^2 (1 - \|P_{\mathcal{N}(S)} P_{\mathcal{R}(S)}\|^2),$$

namely

$$\left\|P_{\mathcal{N}(S)}P_{\mathcal{R}(S)}\right\| \geq \sqrt{1-\|S\|^{-2}}.$$

To prove the reverse inequality, observe that for each $x \in H$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|P_{\mathcal{R}(S)}x\|^2 &= \|SP_{\mathcal{R}(S)}x - SP_{\mathcal{N}(S)}P_{\mathcal{R}(S)}x\|^2 \\ &\leq \|S\|^2\|P_{\mathcal{R}(S)}x - P_{\mathcal{N}(S)}P_{\mathcal{R}(S)}x\|^2 \\ &= \|S\|^2\left(\|P_{\mathcal{R}(S)}x\|^2 - \|P_{\mathcal{N}(S)}P_{\mathcal{R}(S)}x\|^2\right).\end{aligned}$$

Hence, if $S \neq 0$, we have

$$\|P_{\mathcal{N}(S)}P_{\mathcal{R}(S)}x\|^2 \leq (1-\|S\|^{-2})\|P_{\mathcal{R}(S)}x\|^2 \leq (1-\|S\|^{-2})\|x\|^2,$$

namely

$$\left\|P_{\mathcal{N}(S)}P_{\mathcal{R}(S)}\right\| \leq \sqrt{1-\|S\|^{-2}}.$$

Thus, if $S \neq 0$, there holds

$$\left\|P_{\mathcal{N}(S)}P_{\mathcal{R}(S)}\right\| = \sqrt{1-\|S\|^{-2}} < 1.$$

Now, if $S \neq 0$, by Lemma 3.1, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|P_{\mathcal{R}(S)} - P_{\mathcal{R}(S^*)}\right\| &= \max\left\{\left\|\left(I - P_{\mathcal{R}(S^*)}\right)P_{\mathcal{R}(S)}\right\|, \left\|\left(I - P_{\mathcal{R}(S)}\right)P_{\mathcal{R}(S^*)}\right\|\right\} \\ &= \max\left\{\left\|P_{\mathcal{N}(S)}P_{\mathcal{R}(S)}\right\|, \left\|P_{\mathcal{N}(S^*)}P_{\mathcal{R}(S^*)}\right\|\right\} \\ &= \sqrt{1-\|S\|^{-2}} = \sqrt{1-\|S^*\|^{-2}} < 1,\end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$\left\|P_{\mathcal{R}(S)} - P_{\mathcal{R}(S^*)}\right\| = \left\|P_{\mathcal{N}(S)}P_{\mathcal{R}(S)}\right\| = \left\|P_{\mathcal{N}(S^*)}P_{\mathcal{R}(S^*)}\right\|.$$

Note that

$$\left\|P_{\mathcal{R}(S)}P_{\mathcal{N}(S)}\right\| = \left\|\left(P_{\mathcal{N}(S)}P_{\mathcal{R}(S)}\right)^*\right\| = \left\|P_{\mathcal{N}(S)}P_{\mathcal{R}(S)}\right\|.$$

So, it follows that

$$\left\|P_{\mathcal{R}(S)} - P_{\mathcal{R}(S^*)}\right\| = \left\|P_{\mathcal{R}(S)}P_{\mathcal{N}(S)}\right\| = \left\|P_{\mathcal{N}(S)}P_{\mathcal{R}(S)}\right\|, \quad \text{and}$$

$$\left\|P_{\mathcal{N}(S)}P_{\mathcal{R}(S)}\right\| = \begin{cases} \sqrt{1-\|S\|^{-2}}, & \text{as } S \neq 0, \\ 0, & \text{as } S = 0. \end{cases}$$

□

LEMMA 3.4. *Let $T \in \mathcal{B}(X,Y)$ have LPA $\{(X_n, T_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, $\{Q_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be defined as*

$$Q_n := T^{\dagger}P_{T(X_n)}T \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{3.1}$$

Then $\{Q_n\}$ is a sequence of oblique-projections in $\mathcal{B}(X)$ ($Q_n^2 = Q_n \in \mathcal{B}(X)$) which satisfies:

$$\mathcal{N}(Q_n) = [T^*T(X_n)]^{\perp}, \quad \mathcal{R}(Q_n) = T^{\dagger}T(X_n), \tag{3.2}$$

and

$$\operatorname*{s-lim}_{n\to\infty} P_{\mathcal{N}(Q_n)} = P_{\mathcal{N}(T)}, \quad \operatorname*{s-lim}_{n\to\infty} P_{\mathcal{R}(Q_n)} = P_{\mathcal{N}(T)^{\perp}}. \tag{3.3}$$

Proof. Since $T^{\dagger}$ is a closed operator and $T(X_n) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(T^{\dagger})$ $(\forall n)$, due to the closed graph theorem and $T(X_n)$ being closed in Y, we see that each $T^{\dagger}\big|_{T(X_n)}$ is a bound linear operator. Hence, $Q_n := T^{\dagger}P_{T(X_n)}T \in \mathcal{B}(X)$, and

$$Q_n^2 = T^{\dagger}P_{T(X_n)}P_{\overline{\mathcal{R}(T)}}P_{T(X_n)}T = Q_n.$$

It is clear that

$$\mathcal{N}(Q_n) = \mathcal{N}\left(P_{T(X_n)}T\right) = \mathcal{R}\left(T^*P_{T(X_n)}\right)^{\perp} = [T^*T(X_n)]^{\perp},$$

and

$$\mathcal{R}(Q_n) = T^{\dagger}T(X_n) = P_{\mathcal{N}(T)^{\perp}}(X_n) = P_{\overline{\mathcal{R}(T^*)}}(X_n).$$

Thus, we have (3.2) and

$$P_{\mathcal{N}(Q_n)} = I - P_{T^*T(X_n)}, \quad P_{\mathcal{R}(Q_n)} = P_{P_{\overline{\mathcal{R}(T^*)}}(X_n)}.$$

Note that (2.4) holds by statement (a) of Lemma 2.2. Since $T^*T, P_{\overline{\mathcal{R}(T^*)}} \in \mathcal{B}(X)$, by replacing T with T^*T or $P_{\overline{\mathcal{R}(T^*)}}$ in (2.4), it follows that

$$\operatorname*{s-lim}_{n\to\infty} P_{T^*T(X_n)} = P_{\overline{\mathcal{R}(T^*T)}} = P_{\mathcal{N}(T)^{\perp}}$$

and

$$\operatorname*{s-lim}_{n\to\infty} P_{P_{\overline{\mathcal{R}(T^*)}}(X_n)} = P_{\overline{\mathcal{R}(T^*)}} = P_{\mathcal{N}(T)^{\perp}}.$$

Thus, (3.3) holds. □

LEMMA 3.5. *Let $T \in \mathcal{B}(X,Y)$ have LPA $\{(X_n,T_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, $\{Q_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be defined as (3.1). Then, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$1 \le \|I - Q_n\| < +\infty,$$

$$\left\|P_{T^*T(X_n)} - P_{T^{\dagger}T(X_n)}\right\| = \sqrt{1 - \|I - Q_n\|^{-2}} \in [0,1).$$

Proof. Since $\dim \mathcal{R}(Q_n) < \dim X$ $(= \infty)$, then $I - Q_n \neq 0$, and therefore

$$1 \le \|I - Q_n\| < +\infty \quad (\forall n \in \mathbb{N}).$$

By Lemma 3.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|P_{\mathcal{R}(I-Q_n)}-P_{\mathcal{R}(I-Q_n^*)}\right\| &= \left\|P_{\mathcal{R}(I-Q_n)}P_{\mathcal{N}(I-Q_n)}\right\| \\ &= \left\|P_{\mathcal{N}(I-Q_n)}P_{\mathcal{R}(I-Q_n)}\right\| \\ &= \sqrt{1-\|I-Q_n\|^{-2}} \in [0,1)\,.\end{aligned}$$

Note that, by Lemma 3.4,

$$\mathcal{N}(Q_n) = [T^*T(X_n)]^{\perp}\,, \quad \mathcal{R}(Q_n) = T^{\dagger}T(X_n)\,.$$

Hence, there holds

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|P_{T^*T(X_n)}-P_{T^{\dagger}T(X_n)}\right\| &= \left\|P_{\mathcal{N}(Q_n)}-P_{\mathcal{R}(Q_n)^{\perp}}\right\| \\ &= \left\|P_{\mathcal{R}(I-Q_n)}-P_{\mathcal{R}(I-Q_n^*)}\right\| \\ &= \sqrt{1-\|I-Q_n\|^{-2}} \in [0,1)\,.\end{aligned}$$

□

Now, we can present the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Proof. [Proof of Theorem 1.2] By (1.6) we see that

$$\sin\theta_n = \operatorname{gap}\left(T^{\dagger}T(X_n), T^*T(X_n)\right), \quad n\in\mathbb{N}.$$

This, by Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.5, gives that

$$\sin\theta_n = \left\|P_{T^{\dagger}T(X_n)}-P_{T^*T(X_n)}\right\| = \sqrt{1-\|I-Q_n\|^{-2}} \in [0,1)\,, \quad n\in\mathbb{N}. \tag{3.4}$$

(a) It is clear from (3.4) that $\{\theta_n\}$ is a sequence in the interval $\left[0,\frac{\pi}{2}\right)$, and

$$\|I-Q_n\| = \frac{1}{\cos\theta_n} = \sqrt{1+\tan^2\theta_n} \in [1,+\infty)\,, \quad n\in\mathbb{N}. \tag{3.5}$$

Note that

$$P_{\mathcal{N}(T)^{\perp}}T_n^{\dagger}T = T^{\dagger}TT_n^{\dagger}T = T^{\dagger}T_nT_n^{\dagger}T = T^{\dagger}P_{\mathcal{R}(T_n)}T = Q_n,$$

and therefore

$$Q_n = P_{\mathcal{N}(T)^{\perp}}T_n^{\dagger}T \quad \forall n\in\mathbb{N}. \tag{3.6}$$

Assume that (1.3) is valid, this with (3.6) implies that

$$\sup_n\|Q_n\| < +\infty, \quad \sup_n\|I-Q_n\| < +\infty. \tag{3.7}$$

Hence, from (3.7) and (3.5) we obtain

$$\sup_n\theta_n < \frac{\pi}{2}.$$

In addition, by the assertion (b) of Lemma 2.2, we also have

$$(1.3) \implies (1.4).$$

Thus, there holds

$$(1.3) \Longrightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (1.4), \\ \sup_n \theta_n < \frac{\pi}{2}. \end{array} \right.$$

Inversely, suppose (1.4) and $\sup_n \theta_n < \frac{\pi}{2}$ hold. Then (3.7) holds by (3.5). Due to the assertion (c) of Lemma 2.2, it follows from (1.4) with $\dim \mathcal{N}(T) < \infty$ that there is a $n_* \in \mathbb{N}$ such that (2.3) holds and hence

$$\mathcal{R}(T_n^\dagger) = \mathcal{N}(T_n)^\perp = \mathcal{N}(T)^\perp \cap X_n \text{ for } n \geq n_*. \tag{3.8}$$

From (3.6) and (3.8) we have

$$T_n^\dagger T = Q_n + P_{\mathcal{N}(T)} T_n^\dagger T = Q_n \quad \text{for } n \geq n_*. \tag{3.9}$$

Hence, (1.3) follows from (3.9) and (3.7).

(b) Let (1.4) (with $\dim \mathcal{N}(T) < \infty$) hold. Then (2.2), (2.3), (3.5), and (3.9) hold by Lemmas 2.2, 3.2, and 3.5. Hence, there is a $n_* \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$T_n^\dagger - T^\dagger = (Q_n - I) P_{X_n^\perp} T^\dagger \quad \text{on } \mathcal{D}\left(T^\dagger\right), \quad \text{for } n \geq n_*, \tag{3.10}$$

and

$$\left. \begin{array}{c} X_n = \mathcal{N}(T) \overset{\perp}{\oplus} \left(X_n \cap \mathcal{N}(T)^\perp \right), \\ P_{X_n} = P_{\mathcal{N}(T)} + P_{X_n \cap \mathcal{N}(T)^\perp}, \end{array} \right\} \quad \text{for } n \geq n_*. \tag{3.11}$$

From (3.10) and (3.5) it is clear that, for $n \geq n_*$,

$$\left\| T_n^\dagger y - T^\dagger y \right\| \leq \sqrt{1 + \tan^2 \theta_n} \text{dist}\left(T^\dagger y, X_n\right), \quad y \in \mathcal{D}\left(T^\dagger\right). \tag{3.12}$$

Next, we need only to show that, for $n \geq n_*$,

$$\theta_n = 0 \Longleftrightarrow T_n^\dagger = P_{X_n} T^\dagger \text{ on } \mathcal{D}\left(T^\dagger\right) \Longleftrightarrow \mathcal{N}(T) + T^* T(X_n) \subseteq X_n. \tag{3.13}$$

If $\theta_n = 0$ ($n \geq n_*$), then from (3.12) and $\mathcal{R}(T_n^\dagger) = \mathcal{N}(T_n)^\perp \subseteq X_n$ it is clear that

$$T_n^\dagger = P_{X_n} T^\dagger \text{ on } \mathcal{D}\left(T^\dagger\right), \quad n \geq n_*.$$

If the above equality is valid, it follows from (3.9) and (3.11) that

$$Q_n = T_n^\dagger T = P_{X_n} P_{\mathcal{N}(T)^\perp} = P_{X_n \cap \mathcal{N}(T)^\perp}, \quad n \geq n_*,$$

and therefore Q_n is an orthogonal-projection. By use of (3.2) (of Lemma 3.4), there hold

$$\begin{aligned} T^* T(X_n) &= \mathcal{N}(Q_n)^\perp = \mathcal{R}(Q_n) = T^\dagger T(X_n) \\ &\subseteq T^{-1} T(X_n) = X_n + \mathcal{N}(T) = X_n, \quad n \geq n_*, \end{aligned}$$

this gives

$$T^* T(X_n) + \mathcal{N}(T) \subseteq X_n, \quad n \geq n_*.$$

If the above inclusions hold, then

$$T^* T(X_n) \subseteq T^\dagger T(X_n), \quad n \geq n_*,$$

and therefore

$$T^{\dagger}T\left(X_n\right)=T^{*}T\left(X_n\right),\quad n\geq n_{*}.$$

This gives that

$$\sin\theta_n=\operatorname{gap}\left(T^{\dagger}T\left(X_n\right),T^{*}T\left(X_n\right)\right)=0,\quad n\geq n_{*},$$

that is, $\theta_n=0$ $(n\geq n_{*})$. Now, (3.13) is proved. □

REMARK 3.1. *From the proof of Theorem 1.2, we obtain that, even if* $\dim\mathcal{N}\left(T\right)=\infty$,

$$\textit{(1.3)}\Longrightarrow\begin{cases}\textit{(1.4)},\\ \sup_n\theta_n<\frac{\pi}{2}.\end{cases}$$

4. Examples and Remarks. In this section, the two unconvergence examples of Seidman and Du will be restudied under the concepts of offset angle and kernel approximability. This can further explain the relations among the three concepts of strong convergence, offset angle and kernel approximability, and also leads to some remarks on Theorems 1.1 and 1.2.

EXAMPLE 4.1 (Seidman's Example [10, Example 3.1]). *Let*

$$X:=l^2,\quad X_n:=\operatorname{span}\left\{\mathbf{e}^1,\mathbf{e}^2,\ldots,\mathbf{e}^n\right\},$$

where

$$\mathbf{e}^k=(0,\ldots,0,\underset{\substack{\uparrow\\ k\text{th}}}{1},0,\ldots)\quad\forall\ k\in\mathbb{N},$$

and $T:X\to X$ *be given in the form*

$$T\mathbf{x}:=\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\left(\alpha_k\xi_k+\beta_k\xi_1\right)\mathbf{e}^k\quad\forall\mathbf{x}=\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\xi_k\mathbf{e}^k\in X,$$

with

$$\alpha_j:=\begin{cases}j^{-1}, & j\ \textit{odd},\\ j^{-3}, & j\ \textit{even},\end{cases}\qquad\beta_j:=\begin{cases}0, & j=1,\\ j^{-1}, & j>1.\end{cases}$$

This defines a compact, injective linear operator T *with dense range, its LPA* $\{(X_n,T_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *has kernel approximability ((1.4) holds), and the offset angle sequence* $\{\theta_n\}$ *satisfies*

$$0<\theta_n=\arcsin\operatorname{gap}\left(X_n,T^{*}T\left(X_n\right)\right)<\frac{\pi}{2}\ (\forall\, n),\tag{4.1}$$

and

$$\sup_n\theta_n=\frac{\pi}{2}.\tag{4.2}$$

REMARK 4.1. *For the LPA* $\{(X_n,T_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *of Seidman's example, the weak/strong convergence or the condition (1.3) do not hold. The reason for such a unconvergence is caused by the offset angle* θ_n *tending towards perpendicular angle as (4.2)*

shows. ***Note****: LPA* $\{(X_n, T_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *has kernel-approximability since* $\mathcal{N}(T) = \{0\}$*, and therefore has inverse-graph approximability and bounded-weak convergence by Theorem 1.1.*

Proof. It is easy to see that

$$T^*\mathbf{y} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \eta_k(\overline{\alpha_k}\mathbf{e}^k + \overline{\beta_k}\mathbf{e}^1) \quad \forall \mathbf{y} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \eta_k \mathbf{e}^k \in X,$$

and

$$T^*T\mathbf{x} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\alpha_k\xi_k + \beta_k\xi_1)(\overline{\alpha_k}\mathbf{e}^k + \overline{\beta_k}\mathbf{e}^1) \quad \forall \mathbf{x} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \xi_k \mathbf{e}^k \in X.$$

It is clear that

$$\mathcal{N}(T) = \{0\} \subseteq X_n \ (\forall\, n), \qquad T^\dagger = T^{-1} : \mathcal{R}(T) \subseteq X \to X,$$

$$\frac{\pi^2}{6}\mathbf{e}^1 + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \alpha_k\beta_k\mathbf{e}^k = T^*T\mathbf{e}^1 \in T^*T(X_n) \setminus X_n \ (\forall\, n).$$

This implies (1.4) and (4.1). Next, we will show (4.2) holds.

We rewrite $T^*T\mathbf{x}$ for $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_n := \sum_{k=1}^{n} \xi_k \mathbf{e}^k \in X_n$ $(\xi_k := 0 \ \forall k \geq n+1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} T^*T\mathbf{x}_n = &\left[\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} (\alpha_k\xi_k + \beta_k\xi_1)\beta_k + \alpha_1^2\xi_1\right]\mathbf{e}^1 \\ &+ \sum_{k=2}^{n} (\alpha_k\xi_k + \beta_k\xi_1)\alpha_k\mathbf{e}^k + \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} \alpha_k\beta_k\xi_1\mathbf{e}^k, \end{aligned}$$

then we have

$$\begin{aligned} P_{X_n}(T^*T\mathbf{x}_n) = &\left[\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} (\alpha_k\xi_k + \beta_k\xi_1)\beta_k + \alpha_1^2\xi_1\right]\mathbf{e}^1 \\ &+ \sum_{k=2}^{n} (\alpha_k\xi_k + \beta_k\xi_1)\alpha_k\mathbf{e}^k, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$P_{X_n^\perp}(T^*T\mathbf{x}_n) = \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} \alpha_k\beta_k\xi_1\mathbf{e}^k.$$

Now we take $\mathbf{x}_n$ that satisfies

$$\xi_1 = 1, \ \xi_k = -\frac{\beta_k\xi_1}{\alpha_k}, \quad k = 2, ..., n-1,$$

and let $\lambda := \alpha_n\xi_n + \beta_n\xi_1$ be undetermined, we have

$$\begin{aligned} T^*T\mathbf{x}_n &= \left[\lambda\beta_n + \alpha_1^2 + \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} \beta_k^2\right]\mathbf{e}^1 + \lambda\alpha_n\mathbf{e}^n + \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} \alpha_k\beta_k\mathbf{e}^k \\ &= \left(\lambda\beta_n + c_n^2\right)\mathbf{e}^1 + \lambda\alpha_n\mathbf{e}^n + \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} \alpha_k\beta_k\mathbf{e}^k, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$c_n = \alpha_1^2 + \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} \beta_k^2 \le \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k^2} = \frac{\pi^2}{6}.$$

Take $\lambda = \frac{-c_n\beta_n}{\alpha_n^2+\beta_n^2}$, then

$$\begin{cases} \|T^*T\mathbf{x}_n\|^2 = \frac{c_n^2\alpha_n^2}{\alpha_n^2+\beta_n^2} + \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} (\alpha_k\beta_k)^2 \le \frac{\frac{\pi^4}{36}\alpha_n^2}{\alpha_n^2+\beta_n^2} + \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} (\alpha_k\beta_k)^2, \\ \left\|P_{X_n^{\perp}}(T^*T\mathbf{x}_n)\right\|^2 = \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} (\alpha_k\beta_k)^2, \end{cases}$$

Note that, for n even,

$$\frac{\frac{\pi^4}{36}\alpha_n^2}{\alpha_n^2+\beta_n^2} = \frac{O(n^{-6})}{O(n^{-6})+O(n^{-2})} = O(n^{-4}), \quad \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} (\alpha_k\beta_k)^2 = O(n^{-3}).$$

According to the definition of $\delta(T^*T(X_n), X_n)$, we have

$$\delta(T^*T(X_n), X_n) = \sup_{\mathbf{x}\in X_n} \frac{\|P_{X_n^{\perp}}(T^*T\mathbf{x})\|}{\|T^*T\mathbf{x}\|}.$$

So for n even, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathrm{gap}(X_n, T^*T(X_n))]^2 &= [\delta(T^*TX_n, X_n)]^2 \qquad \text{(by Lemma 3.2)} \\ &\ge \frac{1}{1+O(n^{-1})}. \end{aligned}$$

This gives (4.2). □

Example 4.2 (Best-LPA). *Let $K : X \to Y$ be a compact linear operator, $\{(\sigma_n; v_n, u_n)\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ be the singular system for K. Then the $\{\sigma_n^2\}$ are the nonzero eigenvalues of the self-adjoint operator K^*K (and also of KK^*), written down in decreasing order with multiplicity, $\sigma_n > 0$, the $\{v_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is a corresponding complete orthonormal system of eigenvectors of K^*K (which spans $\overline{\mathcal{R}(K^*)} = \overline{\mathcal{R}(K^*K)}$), and the $\{u_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is defined by vectors*

$$u_n := \frac{Kv_n}{\|Kv_n\|} \quad (n = 0, 1, \cdots).$$

The $\{u_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is a complete orthonormal system of eigenvectors of KK^* and span $\overline{\mathcal{R}(K)} = \overline{\mathcal{R}(KK^*)}$, and the following formulae hold:

$$Kv_n = \sigma_n u_n, \quad K^*u_n = \sigma_n v_n.$$

Now, if $\dim \mathcal{N}(K) < \infty$, and if $\{m_n\} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ is an increasing sequence with $\lim_{n\to\infty} m_n = \infty$, take

$$X_n := \mathcal{N}(K) + \mathrm{span}\{v_1, v_2, \cdots, v_{m_n}\} \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Then

$$\mathcal{N}(K) + K^*K(X_n) = \mathcal{N}(K) + \mathrm{span}\left\{\sigma_1^2 v_1, \sigma_2^2 v_2, \cdots, \sigma_{m_n}^2 v_{m_n}, \right\} \subseteq X_n.$$

In this case, we have the best LPA $\{(X_n, K_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *for* K*:*

$$\mathcal{N}(K) \cap X_n = \mathcal{N}(K), \quad \theta_n := \arcsin \operatorname{gap}\left(K^\dagger K(X_n), K^* K(X_n)\right) = 0 \ (\forall\, n),$$

and

$$K_n^\dagger = P_{X_n} K^\dagger \ \text{on}\ \mathcal{D}\left(K^\dagger\right).$$

Example 4.3 (Du's Example [2, Example 2.10]). *Let*

$$X := l^2, \quad X_n := \operatorname{span}\left\{\mathbf{e}^1, \mathbf{e}^2, \ldots, \mathbf{e}^n\right\},$$

and $T : X \to X$ *defined as follows:*

$$Tx := x - \langle x, \mathbf{e}\rangle \mathbf{e} \qquad (x \in X),$$

where $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ *is the inner product on* X *and*

$$\mathbf{e} := \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\mathbf{e}^1 + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2^2}\mathbf{e}^2 + \cdots + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2^k}\mathbf{e}^k + \cdots.$$

This operator satisfies

$$T = T^2 = T^* = T^\dagger \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{N}(T) = \operatorname{span}\{\mathbf{e}\};$$

that is, T *is the orthogonal projection of* X *onto* $\mathbf{e}^\perp$*. For its LPA* $\{(X_n, T_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$*, where*

$$T_n := T P_{X_n}, \quad P_n := P_{X_n}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

we have the following facts:
(a) The offset angle θ_n *satisfies*

$$\theta_n := \arcsin \operatorname{gap}\left(T^\dagger T(X_n), T^* T(X_n)\right) = 0 \ (\forall\, n).$$

(b) The kernel approximability is invalid since

$$\mathcal{N}(T) \cap X_n = \{0\} \neq \mathcal{N}(T) \ \ (\forall\, n).$$

(c) $T_n^\dagger y = P_n y - 4^n \langle (I - P_n) y, e\rangle P_n e$ $(\forall\ y \in X)$*, and for any fixed* $y \in X$*,*

$$\begin{cases} \sup\limits_n \left\|T_n^\dagger y\right\| < \infty \Longleftrightarrow \sup\limits_n 4^n \left|\langle (I - P_n) y, e\rangle\right| < \infty, \\ \operatorname{w}\text{-}\lim\limits_{n\to\infty} T_n^\dagger y = T^\dagger y \Longleftrightarrow \lim\limits_{n\to\infty} 4^n \langle (I - P_n) y, e\rangle = \langle y, e\rangle; \end{cases}$$

taking

$$y := \left(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{4}, \frac{3\sqrt{3}}{4^2}, \ldots, \frac{(2^n - 1)\sqrt{3}}{4^n}, \ldots\right),$$

there hold

$$\sup_n \left\|T_n^\dagger y\right\| < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \operatorname{w}\text{-}\lim_{n\to\infty} T_n^\dagger y \neq T^\dagger y.$$

That indicates that the bounded-weak convergence is invalid.
(d) For any fixed $y \in \mathcal{D}\left(T^{\dagger}\right) = X$,

$$\underset{n\to\infty}{\text{w-lim}} T_n^{\dagger} y = T^{\dagger} y \Longleftrightarrow \underset{n\to\infty}{\text{s-lim}} T_n^{\dagger} y = T^{\dagger} y \Longleftrightarrow \overline{\lim_{n\to\infty}} \left\|T_n^{\dagger} y\right\| \leq \left\|T^{\dagger} y\right\| .$$

REMARK 4.2. *For the LPA* $\{(X_n, T_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *of Du's example, the weak/strong convergence or the condition (1.3) do not hold. The reason for unconvergence is caused by the fact that kernel approximability is invalid.*

Proof. (a) Since $T^{\dagger} = T = T^*$, it is clear that $\theta_n = 0$ $(\forall\, n)$.
(b) See [2, Proposition A.1].
(c) See [2, Propositions A.2 and A.3].
(d) For any fixed $y \in X$, if $\text{w-lim}_{n\to\infty} T_n^{\dagger} y = T^{\dagger} y$, by (c) and $T^{\dagger} = T$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} 4^n \left\langle \left(I - P_n\right) y, e\right\rangle = \left\langle y, e\right\rangle ,$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \left\|T_n^{\dagger} y - T^{\dagger} y\right\| &= \left\|P_n y - 4^n \left\langle \left(I - P_n\right) y, \mathbf{e}\right\rangle P_n \mathbf{e} - y + \left\langle y, \mathbf{e}\right\rangle \mathbf{e}\right\| \\ &\leq \left\|P_n y - y\right\| + \left|4^n \left\langle \left(I - P_n\right) y, \mathbf{e}\right\rangle - \left\langle y, \mathbf{e}\right\rangle\right| + \left|\left\langle y, \mathbf{e}\right\rangle\right| \left\|P_n \mathbf{e} - \mathbf{e}\right\| \\ &\to 0 \quad (n \to \infty) , \end{aligned}$$

that is, $\text{s-lim}_{n\to\infty} T_n^{\dagger} y = T^{\dagger} y$.

If $\text{s-lim}_{n\to\infty} T_n^{\dagger} y = T^{\dagger} y$ holds, then $\overline{\lim}_{n\to\infty} \left\|T_n^{\dagger} y\right\| \leq \left\|T^{\dagger} y\right\|$.

If $y \in \mathcal{D}\left(T^{\dagger}\right)$ and $\overline{\lim}_{n\to\infty} \left\|T_n^{\dagger} y\right\| \leq \left\|T^{\dagger} y\right\|$, then any subsequence $\left\{T_{n_k}^{\dagger} y\right\}$ of $\left\{T_n^{\dagger} y\right\}$ has a subsequence, again denoted by $\left\{T_{n_k}^{\dagger} y\right\}$, converging weakly to some $u \in X$, and

$$\|u\| \leq \underline{\lim_{k\to\infty}} \left\|T_{n_k}^{\dagger} y\right\| \leq \overline{\lim_{k\to\infty}} \left\|T_{n_k}^{\dagger} y\right\| \leq \overline{\lim_{n\to\infty}} \left\|T_n^{\dagger} y\right\| \leq \left\|T^{\dagger} y\right\| . \tag{4.3}$$

Since T is bounded and

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{N}\left(T_n\right)^{\perp} = \left(\mathcal{N}\left(T\right) \cap X_n\right)^{\perp} \cap X_n \subseteq X_n, \\ \underset{n\to\infty}{\text{s-lim}} P_{\mathcal{R}(T_n)} = P_{\overline{\mathcal{R}(T)}}, \end{cases} \quad \text{(by statement (a) of lemma 2.2)}$$

we have that, for all $v \in X$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle T\left(u - T^{\dagger} y\right), v\right\rangle &= \left\langle Tu - TT_{n_k}^{\dagger} y, v\right\rangle + \left\langle TT_{n_k}^{\dagger} y - TT^{\dagger} y, v\right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle u - T_{n_k}^{\dagger} y, T^* v\right\rangle + \left\langle T_{n_k} T_{n_k}^{\dagger} y - TT^{\dagger} y, v\right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle u - T_{n_k}^{\dagger} y, T^* v\right\rangle + \left\langle P_{\mathcal{R}\left(T_{n_k}\right)} y - P_{\overline{\mathcal{R}(T)}} y, v\right\rangle \\ &\to 0 \quad (k \to \infty) , \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$u \in T^{\dagger} y + \mathcal{N}\left(T\right), \quad \|u\|^2 = \left\|T^{\dagger} y\right\|^2 + \left\|u - T^{\dagger} y\right\|^2 .$$

This with (4.3) implies that

$$\underset{k\to\infty}{\text{w-lim}} T_{n_k}^{\dagger} y = u = T^{\dagger} y \quad \text{with} \quad \lim_{k\to\infty} \left\|T_{n_k}^{\dagger} y\right\| = \left\|T^{\dagger} y\right\| ,$$

that is,

$$\underset{k\to\infty}{\text{s-}\lim} T_{n_k}^{\dagger} y = T^{\dagger} y.$$

Thus, every subsequence of $\left\{T_n^{\dagger} y\right\}$ has a subsequence converging weakly to $T^{\dagger} y$ and hence

$$\underset{n\to\infty}{\text{w-}\lim} T_n^{\dagger} y = T^{\dagger} y, \quad \text{in fact,} \quad \underset{n\to\infty}{\text{s-}\lim} T_n^{\dagger} y = T^{\dagger} y.$$

Note that the proof of this paragraph applies to a general LPA! □

REMARK 4.3. *From the above proof we actually obtain a more general result compared with the one obtained by Luecke and Hickey [9, Theorem 11], who give the result in the situation of LPA $\{(X_n, T_n)\}$ with an increasing sequence:*

$$X_0 \subseteq X_1 \subseteq X_2 \subseteq \cdots \quad \textit{with} \quad \overline{\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} X_n} = X\,.$$

The extended version is as below:

PROPOSITION 4.1. *Let $T \in \mathcal{B}(X, Y)$ have LPA $\{(X_n, T_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. For a fixed $y \in \mathcal{D}\left(T^{\dagger}\right)$ there holds*

$$\underset{n\to\infty}{\text{s-}\lim} T_n^{\dagger} y = T^{\dagger} y \iff \overline{\lim_{n\to\infty}} \left\|T_n^{\dagger} y\right\| \le \left\|T^{\dagger} y\right\|. \qquad \text{(True)}$$

REMARK 4.4. *It should be noted that the following proposition is false.*

PROPOSITION 4.2. *Let $T \in \mathcal{B}(X, Y)$ have LPA $\{(X_n, T_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. For a fixed $y \in \mathcal{D}\left(T^{\dagger}\right)$,*

$$\underset{n\to\infty}{\text{w-}\lim} T_n^{\dagger} y = T^{\dagger} y \iff \sup_n \left\|T_n^{\dagger} y\right\| < +\infty. \qquad \text{(False)}$$

5. Conclusions. In this paper, we propose two concepts – the offset angle and the kernel approximability of LPA, and show their roles in the convergence of least-squares projection method. These concepts come from the wish to understand two counter-examples (due to Seidman [10] and Du [2]) which respectively represent two important cases in which least-squares projection method fails to converge. Let us reformulate the concepts of the offset angles, the kernel approximability, and the strong/weak convergence of least-squares projection method:

- *Offset Angle*:

$$\theta_n := \arcsin \operatorname{gap}\left(T^{\dagger} T\left(X_n\right), T^{*} T\left(X_n\right)\right) \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

- *Kernel Approximability*:

$$\mathcal{N}(T) = \left\{x \in X \,:\, \lim_{n\to\infty} \operatorname{dist}\left(x, \mathcal{N}(T) \cap X_n\right) = 0\right\}.$$

- *Strong Convergence* ($\underset{n\to\infty}{\text{s-}\lim} T_n^{\dagger} = T^{\dagger}$ on $\mathcal{D}\left(T^{\dagger}\right)$):

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} T_n^{\dagger} y = T^{\dagger} y \quad \forall\, y \in \mathcal{D}\left(T^{\dagger}\right).$$

- *Weak Convergence* ($\underset{n\to\infty}{\text{w-}\lim} T_n^\dagger = T^\dagger$ on $\mathcal{D}\left(T^\dagger\right)$):

$$\underset{n\to\infty}{\text{w-}\lim} T_n^\dagger y = T^\dagger y \quad \forall\, y \in \mathcal{D}\left(T^\dagger\right).$$

To understand the relevance among the four concepts, we make a table to show the true and false status of these concepts in the several examples we have mentioned (T for true, F for false).

Examples	$\sup_n \theta_n < \frac{\pi}{2}$	Kernel Approximability	Strong/weak Convergence
Seidman's	F	T	F
Du's	T	F	F
Best-LPA	T	T	T

From this table we can see that the conditions "kernel approximability" and "$\sup_n \theta_n < \frac{\pi}{2}$" are two mutually independent important factors of a convergent LPA $\{(X_n, T_n)\}$. In fact, both of them are necessary if we want the convergence of LPA $\{(X_n, T_n)\}$, for we have that (see Remak 3.1)

$$\text{weak convergence} \Longleftrightarrow \text{strong convergence} \Longrightarrow \begin{cases} \text{kernel approximability}, \\ \sup_n \theta_n < \frac{\pi}{2}. \end{cases}$$

We hope the three are equivalent, if so, the problem of strong/weak convergence of least-squares projection method could be divided into two subproblems, namely, the kernel approximability problem and the offset angle problem.

In this paper, the main result (Theorem 1.2) we get is: If $\dim \mathcal{N}(T) < \infty$, then

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} \text{kernel approximability} \\ \sup_n \theta_n < \frac{\pi}{2} \end{array}\right\} \Longleftrightarrow \text{strong convergence} \Longleftrightarrow \text{weak convergence},$$

and when the kernel approximability is valid, for n large enough,

$$\left\|T_n^\dagger y - T^\dagger y\right\| \le \sqrt{1+\tan^2\theta_n}\,\text{dist}\left(T^\dagger y, X_n\right) \quad \forall y \in \mathcal{D}\left(T^\dagger\right).$$

Now, we consider the three special cases of "$\mathcal{N}(T) = \{0\}$", "$\mathcal{R}(T) = \overline{\mathcal{R}(T)}$", and "$\mathcal{N}(T) = \{0\}$ & $\mathcal{R}(T) = \overline{\mathcal{R}(T)}$", then there hold the following interesting corollaries:

- If $\mathcal{N}(T) = \{0\}$, then, for any LPA $\{(X_n, T_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ for T,

$$\sup_n \theta_n < \frac{\pi}{2} \Longleftrightarrow \text{strong convergence},$$

and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\left\|T_n^\dagger y - T^\dagger y\right\| \le \sqrt{1+\tan^2\theta_n}\,\text{dist}\left(T^\dagger y, X_n\right) \quad \forall y \in \mathcal{D}\left(T^\dagger\right).$$

- If $\dim \mathcal{N}(T) < \infty$ and $\mathcal{R}(T)$ is closed, then, for any LPA $\{(X_n, T_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ for T,

$$\begin{cases} \text{kernel approximability} \Longleftrightarrow \text{strong convergence}, \\ \sup_n \theta_n < \frac{\pi}{2}, \end{cases}$$

and when the kernel approximability holds, for n large enough,

$$\left\|T_n^\dagger y - T^\dagger y\right\| \le \sqrt{1+\tan^2\theta_n}\,\text{dist}\left(T^\dagger y, X_n\right) \quad \forall y \in Y.$$

- If $\mathcal{N}(T) = \{0\}$ and $\mathcal{R}(T)$ is closed, then for any LPA $\{(X_n, T_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ for T,

$$\sup_n \theta_n < \frac{\pi}{2},$$

and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\left\|T_n^\dagger y - T^\dagger y\right\| \leq \sqrt{1+\tan^2\theta_n}\,\mathrm{dist}\,\left(T^\dagger y, X_n\right) \quad \forall y \in Y.$$

Here, we remark that: If there are positive constants α and β such that $T \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ satisfies

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} |\langle Tu, u\rangle| \geq \alpha \|u\|^2, \\ |\langle Tu, v\rangle| \leq \beta \|u\| \|v\| \end{array}\right\} \text{ for all } u, v \in X,$$

then T has a bounded inverse $T^{-1} \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ by Lax-Milgram theorem (see [8, Theorem 13.26]), and

$$\sup_n \sqrt{1+\tan^2\theta_n} \leq \|T\| \left\|T^{-1}\right\| \leq \frac{\beta}{\alpha}.$$

The significance of Theorem 1.2 is partially revealed by its corollaries. The theorem shows us the clue to choose convergent LPA: First, we need X_n $(n \in \mathbb{N})$ to guarantee the kernel approximability, which restricts the class of choices for X_n. Then, we choose specific X_n $(n \in \mathbb{N})$ such that their offset angles θ_n are as small as possible, because the small angles can not only guarantee the convergence but also give us faster rate of convergence.

The kernel approximability of LPA is often easy to be satisfied because it is a much weaker condition compared to the condition (1.3) (For instance, in the case of T being an injection, it is always true). Theorem 1.1 presents several equivalent conditions of kernel approximability, which are:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{kernel approximability} &\Longleftrightarrow \mathrm{s}\text{-}\lim_{n\to\infty} P_{\mathcal{N}(T_n)} = P_{\mathcal{N}(T)} \\ &\Longleftrightarrow \mathrm{s}\text{-}\lim_{n\to\infty} P_{\mathcal{G}\left(T_n^\dagger\right)} = P_{\mathcal{G}(T^\dagger)} \\ &\Longleftrightarrow \text{bounded-weak convergence.} \end{aligned}$$

These equivalent characterizations of kernel approximability could help us better understand it. From these equivalent characterizations, we can see that the kernel approximability is a weaker version of convergence (that is also the reason why we name one of its equivalent characterizations as bounded-weak convergence).

The interesting points about offset angle and kernel approximability are the geometrical revelations they show. To be more specific, the offset angle θ_n is just the largest canonical angle between $T^*T(X_n)$ and $T^\dagger T(X_n)$, which are subspaces of $\mathcal{N}(T)^\perp$; the kernel approximability is defined by the sequence $\{\mathcal{N}(T) \cap X_n\}$, in which each element $\mathcal{N}(T) \cap X_n$ is a subspace of $\mathcal{N}(T)$. Thus the angle between $T^*T(X_n)$ and $T^\dagger T(X_n)$ in $\mathcal{N}(T)^\perp$, and the kernel approximability determined by the spaces $\mathcal{N}(T) \cap X_n$ in $\mathcal{N}(T)$, together geometrically depict the convergence of least-squares projection method.

Acknowledgement. The author Nailin Du's research was partially supported by LIESMARS of Wuhan University (904110354) and China National Natural Science Foundations (61179039 and 61273215).

REFERENCES

[1] N. Du, *The basic principles for stable approximations to orthogonal generalized inverses of linear operators in Hilbert spaces*, Numer. Funct. Anal. Optim., **26** (2005), pp. 675–708.
[2] N. Du, *Finite-dimensional approximation settings for infinite-dimensional Moore–Penrose inverses*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., **46** (2008), pp. 1454-1482.
[3] H. W. Engl, M. Hanke, and A. Neubauer, *Regularization of Inverse Problems,* Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1996.
[4] G. H. Golub and C. F. Van Loan, *Matrix computations*, Third Edition, JHU Press, Maryland, 1996.
[5] C. W. Groetsch and A. Neubauer, *Convergence of a general projection method for an operator equation of the first kind*, Houston J. Math., **14** (1988), pp. 201–208.
[6] C. W. Groetsch, *On a regularization-Ritz method for Fredholm equations of the first kind*, J. Integral Equations, **4** (1982), pp. 173–182.
[7] T. Kato, *Perturbation Theory for Linear Operators*, Second Edition, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1980.
[8] R. Kress, *Linear Integral Equations,* Second edition, Springer-Verlag, New York, Inc., 1999.
[9] G. R. Luecke and K. R. Hickey, *Convergence of approximate solutions of an operator equation*, Houston J. Math., **11** (1985), pp. 345–354.
[10] T. I. Seidman, *Nonconvergence results for the application of least-squares estimation to ill-posed problems*, J. Optim. Theory Appl., **30** (1980), pp. 535–547.
[11] R. D. Spies and K. G. Temperini, *Arbitrary divergence speed of the least-squares method in infinite-dimensional inverse ill-posed problems*, Inverse Problems, 22 (2006), pp. 611–626.
[12] G. W. Stewart, *On the perturbation of pseudo-inverses, projections and linear least-squares problems*, SIAM Review, **19** (1977), pp. 634–662.